

U.N. Bloc Seeks Peking View

UNITED NATIONS, N.Y., Nov. 9 (UPI)—The sponsors of a resolution to seat Communist China in the United Nations today asked Peking to decide whether the proposal should demand the expulsion of Nationalist China.

Unable to agree on the wording of the resolution, Cambodia, Albania and nine other sponsors of the resolution turned to Communist China to resolve the issue.

It was widely believed that the resolution—now expected by the United States to be

beaten by a handful of votes—would meet with greater success if it dropped the requirement for ejecting President Chiang Kai-shek's government.

Some delegations that believe Communist China should be admitted to the United Nations are unwilling to pay the price of ejecting the Nationalist government.

Expulsion Backed

Diplomatic sources close to the sponsors of the pro-Peking resolution said Communist

China had sent no reply as of mid-day.

Both Cambodia and Albania maintain close ties with the Chinese Communists and communications on the question could be dispatched quickly through their diplomatic channels. Some of the pro-Peking sponsors voiced the belief that Communist China would stick to its position that the Nationalists must be expelled from the United Nations as a prerequisite for Peking's membership.

This view was backed in the

opening round of the debate yesterday by Cambodia and Albania and was backed in today's debate by Algeria, Czechoslovakia, Somalia and Afghanistan.

Sides with U.S.

Madagascar sided with the U.S. position that the seating of Communist China is an "important" question requiring a two-thirds majority vote and that Nationalist China is the sole representative of the Chinese people.

At the same time, U.S. Ambassador Arthur J. Goldberg again voiced opposition to the admission of Communist China to the world organization.

In a speech at a luncheon given by New York Mayor Robert F. Wagner, Goldberg said the leaders of Peking "say that war is the only way to solve the world's problems today."

Moreover, Goldberg said, Peking "has laid down certain conditions—such as expulsion of the Republic of China and

on Taiwan Ouster

a virtual apology for the U.N.'s action in Korea, just to name two—that clearly indicate she is not serious about membership.”

France Delays Speech

The China debate in the Assembly moved slowly today because few countries listed to speak were ready when called by Assembly President Amintore Fanfani.

France was scheduled to speak today but a French spokesman said the speech probably would be postponed until Wednesday.

A British spokesman said that Britain, which will vote for Communist China, would not take part in the debate except to explain its vote.

France remained the big question mark. It is expected to call for Peking's admission but whether it would support the U.S. position that the seating of Peking is an “important” question and requiring two-thirds majority was not known.

[When the Assembly last debated the China issue in 1963, it turned in a 16-vote majority against a resolution to oust the Chinese Nationalists and seat the Chinese Communists in all U.N. organs. The vote was 41 for, 57 against and 12 abstaining. At that time the United Nations had 111 members, and the no-vote represented 51 per cent of the membership. Associated Press reported.]

Peking Charges Russia Is Plotting With U.S.

TOKYO, Nov. 10 (Wednesday) (AP)—Communist China assailed the Soviet leadership today, accusing the Russians of working with the United States to dominate the world.

The new attack was contained in an editorial of the official People's Daily broadcast by the New China News Agency.

Only Saturday, Soviet First Deputy Premier Dmitri S. Polyansky had called for better relations with the United

States and China. But he said the Kremlin had done all it could to improve relations with Peking and “now it depends upon the Chinese leaders.”

Whether this was Peking's

answer or not, the editorial made it clear the Chinese were in no mood to make up. People's Daily said the new Soviet leadership was “pursuing Khrushchevism without Khrushchev.”